

**REMARKS**

Claim 33 has been amended to overcome the rejection based on 35 USC 112, paragraph 1. Claim 33 has also been amended to limit the records to ENUM records, as discussed, *inter alia*, on page 7 of the application as filed. As indicated in the application as filed, as well as enclosed Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 (respectively definitions of ENUM appearing in Webopedia, the homepage of ENUM.org, and an article entitled "WHAT IS ENUM?" appearing at the ENUM.org web site) an ENUM record is involved in transforming telephone numbers into a universal identifier that can be used across many different devices and applications, such as voice, fax, mobile, e-mail, text messaging, location-based services and the Internet. Claim 33 now indicates the system is for consulting and/or updating an ENUM record and that a request to read or update an ENUM record is transmitted to a server by indirection in a dynamic directory server.

New independent claim 65 is similar to amended claim 33, except claim 65 is limited to updating ENUM records. New dependent claim 66 is similar to amended claim 33, except claim 66 is limited to consulting and reading an ENUM record.

Claim 33 and the newly added independent claims distinguish over the art of record by requiring consulting and/or updating an ENUM record. The systems of claims 33, 65 and 66 enable a terminal user to more easily consult and/or modify ENUM records, to enable records to be more frequently updated. In prior art ENUM record systems, a user has difficulty in rapidly and efficiently consulting and/or modifying his/her ENUM profile stored in a DNS server or an LDAP directory. Because none of the prior art applied against the claims is concerned with consulting and/or modifying ENUM records, this prior art is not concerned with the problems applicant faced. Thus, independent claims 33, 65 and 66 are not anticipated by or rendered obvious by the art applied against the claims.

Consequently, the anticipation rejection of claims 33 to 43, 51 and 58-60 based on Call, US Patent 6,154,738, the rejection of claims 52-57 and 64 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call, the rejection of claims 44-47 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call in view of Reed, US Patent 5,862,325, the rejection of claims 48-50

and 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call in view of Skarpelos et al., US Patent 5,590,274, and the rejection of claims 61-63 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call in view of the Falstrom article entitled "E.164 number and DNS" are obviated.

Call relates to a completely different domain from the system of claims 33, 65 and 66 which allows a subscriber to modify ENUM records stored in a database of a DNS or LDAP server, from a terminal such as a wireless handset or a personal computer. While Falstrom relates to transforming E.164 numbers into DNS names, it is not concerned with a terminal user consulting and/or modifying ENUM records, so one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Call and Falstrom to arrive at the systems defined by claims 33, 64 and/or 65 because neither reference relates to the problems applicant confronted.

The dependent claims are allowable for the same reasons advanced for claim 33 upon which they depend.

Allowance is in order.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP**

/Allan M. Lowe/

Allan M. Lowe  
Registration No. 19,641

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111

(703) 518-5499 Facsimile

**Date: January 21, 2009**

**AML/cjf**